UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/539,089	12/14/2005	Tomi Veikonheimo	034382-004	9066	
21839 7590 10/24/2007 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404			EXAMINER		
			VENNE, DANIEL V		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3617		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/24/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com debra.hawkins@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/539,089	VEIKONHEIMO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Daniel V. Venne	3617		

	Daniel V. Venne	3617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) 	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a see with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must of the final rejection. Individual set for the date set for the date set for the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Clust be filed within one in the final rejection, who date of the final rejecti	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following ichever is later. In on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the appropria	to outonales for
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further colling (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	:		١.
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-14. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ wil vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	s necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a I).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.			

Continuation of 13. Other: After-final amendment received from applicant on 10/11/2007 is entered. Amendments are provided to overcome objections raised in the previous office action and place in the application in better form for appeal. Claims 1-14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Varis, in view of Parsons, as indicated in the previous Office Action. Varis discloses all of the claimed features, with the exception of at least two equally distributed flow plates arranged on the cap of the forward propeller radially projecting from the cap. Parsons teaches a propeller hub (boss) cap (cone) (Figs. 3 and 4 of Parsons NO10907 and Figs. 5 and 6 of Parsons GB 9792) comprising a plurality of equally spaced flow plates (blades or vanes) [v] projecting from the cap in a radial direction with no inclination and without extending beyond the diameter of the cap for reducing cavitation and enhancing flow characteristics. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to modify to provide a propeller cap with flow plates as taught by Parsons for the forward propeller hub of Varis to create the invention as claimed by applicant. The motivation would have been to reduce or minimize cavitation effects.

DW 10/18/2007

> LARS A. OLSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

> > 10/18/07